## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1763

PETROS HAILE,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A74-961-941)

Submitted: July 30, 2004 Decided: August 19, 2004

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Payne, BLAIR & LEE, P.C., College Park, Maryland, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Norah Ascoli Schwarz, Senior Litigation Counsel, John C. Cunningham, Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

## PER CURIAM:

Petros Haile, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming, without opinion, the Immigration Judge's (IJ) decision to deny asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.

Haile disputes the IJ's conclusion that he failed to meet his evidentiary burden to qualify for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence he presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Haile fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that Haile seeks.

Additionally, we reject Haile's contention that the Board's summary affirmance of the IJ's decision violated his rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. See Blanco de Belbruno v. Ashcroft, 362 F.3d 272, 280-83 (4th Cir. 2004).

We therefore deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.